



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M/S  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,818	02/04/2004	Clay Fisher	Sony-06400	3957
36813	7590	10/18/2006	EXAMINER	
O'BANION & RITCHIE LLP/ SONY ELECTRONICS, INC. 400 CAPITOL MALL SUITE 1550 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814			VILLECCO, JOHN M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2622	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/771,818	FISHER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	John M. Villecco	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 25 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/1/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

### *Claim Objections*

3. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - In lines 2-3 of claim 25, applicant recites the phrase "while capturing a captured image". This invention deals with capturing new images, not images that have

already been captured. It appears that applicant means to use the phrase – while capturing an image –.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Regarding independent claims 1, 15, 16, 25, and 33, applicant recites some form of the limitation of broadcasting signal to the device. As defined by Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, "broadcasting" information relates to transmitting information via a radio or television. The specification does not disclose transmitting the information via a radio or television program. The signal is merely transmitted to the device, not broadcast via a radio or television. For examination purposes it will be assumed that the applicant meant to use the word transmitting instead of broadcasting.

7. Claims 2-14, 17-24, and 26-28 are rejected based on their dependency to independent claims 1, 16, and 25, respectively.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. **Claims 1-6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 29, 30, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217).**

10. Regarding *claim 1*, Rodriguez discloses a camera capable of automatically recording photograph information. More specifically, Rodriguez discloses a device (digital camera, 17), which when within a predetermined region (20), communicates with the camera (see paragraph 0016). When the user decides to capture an image, they point the camera at the desired target and communication between the communication device (16) of the camera and the bidirectional device (18) occurs. Based on the location of the user (i.e. the subject which the user is next to) the subject of the image is known. Additional information (19) about the subject (see paragraph 0015) stored in the database (34) is then sent to the camera.

11. As for *claim 2*, Rodriguez discloses that the transmissions may be directional so that data on orientation of the photographer may be included in the information. Thus, the system has a way of determining the direction of the device. See the end of paragraph 0015.

12. With regard to *claim 3*, Rodriguez discloses that based upon the direction that the camera is facing, information can be tailored for that direction. See the end of paragraph 0015.

13. Regarding ***claim 4***, Rodriguez discloses the use of a memory (16b) which is used to store the information (19) when received. See paragraph 0019. The memory (16b) is interpreted to be the storage module.

14. As for ***claim 5***, Rodriguez discloses sending information (19) such as history of the site, details of construction, summary of people and events associated with the site, recorded speeches given at the site, and film or photographs of the site. See paragraph 0015. This information is interpreted as metadata.

15. With regard to ***claim 6***, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 5, Rodriguez discloses that the information can be background information. Rodriguez discloses sending information (19) such as history of the site, details of construction, summary of people and events associated with the site, recorded speeches given at the site, and film or photographs of the site. See paragraph 0015.

16. Regarding ***claim 9***, Rodriguez discloses that the device (17) is a digital camera. See paragraph 0015.

17. As for ***claim 12***, as mentioned above, Rodriguez discloses sending information (19) such as history of the site, details of construction, summary of people and events associated with the site, recorded speeches given at the site, and film or photographs of the site. See paragraph 0015. Since this information is unique to the object being photographed, this information is interpreted to a unique identifier.

18. With regard to ***claim 15***, Rodriguez discloses a camera capable of automatically recording photograph information. More specifically, Rodriguez discloses a device (digital camera, 17), which when within a predetermined region (20), communicates with the camera

(see paragraph 0016). When the user decides to capture an image, they point the camera at the desired target and communication between the communication device (16) of the camera and the bidirectional device (18) occurs. Based on the location of the user (i.e. the subject which the user is next to) the subject of the image is known. The means for detecting a device, the means for detecting an image, and the means for determining a subject is interpreted to be the microprocessor (30) of the bi-directional device. Additional information (19) about the subject (see paragraph 0015) stored in the database (34) is then sent to the camera. The transmitter (24) is interpreted to be the means for broadcasting.

19. As for *claim 16*, Rodriguez discloses a camera capable of automatically recording photograph information. More specifically, Rodriguez discloses a device (digital camera, 17), which when within a predetermined region (20), communicates with the camera (see paragraph 0016). When the user decides to capture an image, they point the camera at the desired target and communication between the communication device (16) of the camera and the bidirectional device (18) occurs. Based on the location of the user (i.e. the subject which the user is next to) the subject of the image is known. Additional information (19) about the subject (see paragraph 0015) stored in the database (34) is then sent to the camera. Additionally, Rodriguez discloses that the transmissions may be directional so that data on orientation of the photographer may be included in the information. Thus, the system has a way of determining the direction of the device. See the end of paragraph 0015. Rodriguez discloses sending information (19) such as history of the site, details of construction, summary of people and events associated with the site, recorded speeches given at the site, and film or photographs of the site. See paragraph 0015.

Since this information is unique to the object being photographed, this information is interpreted to a unique identifier.

20. As for *claim 18*, Rodriguez discloses that the information can be sent as text. See paragraph 0017. Thus, the unique identifier can be a string of characters.

21. With regard to *claim 29*, Rodriguez discloses a camera capable of automatically recording photograph information. More specifically, Rodriguez discloses a device (digital camera, 17), which when within a predetermined region (20), communicates with the camera (see paragraph 0016). When the user decides to capture an image, they point the camera at the desired target and communication between the communication device (16) of the camera and the bidirectional device (18) occurs. By detecting an electronic signal from the digital camera (17), the bidirectional device (18) recognizes that a device is in the area. The processor (28) of the bidirectional device (18) is interpreted to be the recognition module. The processor (28) of the bidirectional device then sends information to the camera describing the location and the subject. Thus, the processor is also interpreted to be the location module and the subject module. Based on the location of the user (i.e. the subject which the user is next to) the subject of the image is known. Additional information (19) about the subject (see paragraph 0015) stored in the database (34) is then sent to the camera. The camera includes a memory (16b) which is used to store the information (19) when received. See paragraph 0019. The memory (16b) is interpreted to be the storage module.

22. Regarding *claim 30*, Rodriguez discloses sending information (19) such as history of the site, details of construction, summary of people and events associated with the site, recorded

speeches given at the site, and film or photographs of the site. See paragraph 0015. This information is interpreted as metadata.

23. As for *claim 32*, Rodriguez discloses the use of a transmitter (24), which is interpreted to be the interface module, for transmitting the information to the device.

24. *Claim 33* is considered to be substantively equivalent to claim 16. Please see the discussion of claim 16 on the preceding pages. Claim 33 also includes the preamble of “A computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing a method comprising.” Rodriguez discloses that his invention can be embodied by a computer program code containing instructions disposed in a tangible media. See paragraph 0026.

25. Claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Keskar et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0125216).

26. Regarding *claim 25*, Keskar discloses a method of context based tagging used for location based services. More specifically, Keskar discloses a method of detecting a device within a predetermined area. This is done using the location detecting device (104). After capturing an image, the image is compared to a database of reference images to determine an image that most closely resembles the captured image. A subject is determined based on this comparison. See paragraphs 0018-0025. Furthermore, information about the subject is returned to the device for viewing by the user. See paragraphs 0009-0010 and 0027-0028.

27. As for *claim 26*, Keskar discloses that the information provided to the device is additional information about the object being photographed. This is interpreted to be metadata.

28. With regard to ***claim 27***, Keskar discloses that the information provided to the device is additional information about the object being photographed. This information is unique to the subject. Therefore, the examiner is broadly reading this information to be a unique identifier corresponding to the subject.
29. Regarding ***claim 28***, Keskar discloses that if it is used in an art museum, the reference images can be various paintings and rooms within the art museum. See paragraph 0018.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

30. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
31. **Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Pelletier (U.S. Patent No. 6,690,883).**

32. Regarding ***claim 7***, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Rodriguez discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. While Rodriguez does disclose providing textual information to a user, he fails to specifically disclose providing text with a keyword describing the subject, although it is more than likely that he does at some point, when describing the history or other data associated with the subject. Pelletier, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to provide a camera with keywords based on location information for annotation when capturing an image. More specifically, Pelletier discloses a camera (110) which annotates an image based on the location and subject of the image using a key word. See column

3, line 48 to column 4, line 55. This feature allows the user to understand what they are viewing and capturing an image of. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a keyword describing the subject with the metadata of Rodriguez, so that the user knows what they are looking at.

33. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Aarnio (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,889).

34. Regarding claim 8, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Rodriguez discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Rodriguez fails to disclose that the metadata information includes advertising related to the subject. Aarnio, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to provide advertisements to user depending on the location of the user. More specifically, Aarnio discloses a system for providing precise location information through a communication network. This system includes the ability to determine the location of the user and then provide advertisement for any retailer which may be near the location. See column 5, lines 25-40. This provides a convenient way for advertiser to reach user who may be in the vicinity and provide users with special offers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide advertisements to the users of Rodriguez so that retailers can reach nearby customers.

35. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217).

Art Unit: 2622

36. Regarding *claim 10*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Rodriguez discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. Additionally Rodriguez discloses that the device can be any type of personal digital communications equipment (PDCD). However, Rodriguez fails to disclose that the personal digital communication equipment is specifically a cellular phone with an image capture module. Official Notice is taken as to the fact that it is well known in the art to combine a cellular phone with an image capture module. This combination allows for a highly integrated device capable of making phone calls and capturing images and the transmission thereof. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the PDCD of Rodriguez a cellular phone with an image capture module so that a highly integrated device is formed.

37. As for *claim 11*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Rodriguez discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Rodriguez fails to disclose that the camera is a video camera. Official Notice is taken as to the fact that it is well known in the art to capture video with a digital camera. The capture of video allows for images over time, thereby giving some context to the images being captured. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the camera of Rodriguez to capture video.

38. Claims 13, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Keskar et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0125216).

Art Unit: 2622

39. Regarding ***claim 13***, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 12, Rodriguez discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Rodriguez fails to disclose matching the unique identifier with metadata information describing the subject. Keskar, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to determine an object and return a unique identifier to the user in order to match it with locally stored metadata. More specifically, Keskar discloses a method of detecting a device within a predetermined area. This is done using the location detecting device (104). After capturing an image, the image is compared to a database of reference images to determine an image that most closely resembles the captured image. A subject is determined based on this comparison. See paragraphs 0018-0025. Furthermore, information about the subject is returned to the device for viewing by the user. See paragraphs 0009-0010 and 0027-0028. This information can be in the form of an index that represents contents of a specified track on a locally held information storage device. See paragraph 0010. The index is interpreted by the examiner to be a unique identifier and the track information is interpreted to be the metadata. By transferring only an index to the user, less information is transferred, resulting in less bandwidth required and a more secure transfer. It also reduces the amount of storage needed by the server. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to match a unique identifier with metadata information describing subject, so that less information is transferred and less server storage is required.

40. ***Claim 19*** is considered substantively equivalent to claim 13. Please see the discussion of claim 13 above.

Art Unit: 2622

41. As for *claim 22*, Rodriguez discloses that when the user captures an image of the subject the metadata is transferred to the user to aid in their understanding of the subject. Therefore, the metadata is integrated with the image in order for the user to get additional information about the subject.

42. Claims 14, 17, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Baron (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,388).

43. Regarding *claim 14*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 12, Rodriguez discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Rodriguez fails to specifically disclose that the unique identifier is a URL. Baron, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to transmit a URL to a camera based on the position of the camera. More specifically, Baron discloses a camera (400) capable of sending a GPS position to a database (300). The database evaluates the position and returns information pertinent to the position. One of the things it returns is a URL for weather information. See column 6, lines 1-5. This allows the processor (24) to access additional information about the location. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer URL information to the device of Rodriguez so that additional information about the location may be obtained.

44. *Claim 17* is considered substantively equivalent to claim 14. Please see the discussion of claim 14 above.

45. *Claim 31* is considered substantively equivalent to claim 14. Please see the discussion of claim 14 above.

46. **Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Keskar et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0125216) and further in view of Seaman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,112).**

47. Regarding *claim 21*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 19, the combination of Rodriguez and Keskar discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, neither of the aforementioned references specifically discloses the further step of requesting a payment from the device prior to matching the unique identifier. Seaman, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to request payment prior to providing content information to a user. More specifically, Seaman discloses a camera (102) capable of connected to a remote location (100) for providing metadata to a user (col. 6, lines 22-30). Before providing the content information to the camera, a user is required to pay for the service. See column 5, lines 25-35. Thus, before any of the content information is transferred to the user, a payment is required. This allows for the owner of the content information to be compensated for their service. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the device of Rodriguez to request from the device prior to matching the unique identifier as in Keskar, so that the owner of the information can be compensated.

48. **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Keskar et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0125216) and further in view of Baron (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,388).**

49. Regarding *claim 20*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 19, the combination of Rodriguez and Keskar discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, the aforementioned references fail to specifically disclose that the metadata information is then broadcast to the device. Baron, on the other hand, discloses a camera (400) capable of sending a GPS position to a database (300). The database evaluates the position and returns information pertinent to the position. One of the things it returns is a URL for weather information. See column 6, lines 1-5. This allows the processor (24) to access additional information about the location. After accessing the URL the information from the website pertaining to the weather is sent to the device. This meets the limitation of broadcasting the metadata information to the device. By doing this, the user has the ability to access additional metadata information from a remote location via the Internet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to broadcast the metadata information that was matched with the unique identifier to the device so that additional information is provided to the user of the device.

50. **Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Keskar et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0125216) and further in view of Aarnio (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,889).**

51. Regarding *claim 23*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 19, the combination of Rodriguez and Keskar discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, the aforementioned references fail to specifically disclose that the metadata information includes advertising related to the subject. Aarnio, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to provide advertisements to user depending on the location of the user. More specifically, Aarnio discloses a system for providing precise location information through a communication network. This system includes the ability to determine the location of the user and then provide advertisement for any retailer which may be near the location. See column 5, lines 25-40. This provides a convenient way for advertiser to reach user who may be in the vicinity and provide users with special offers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide advertisements to the users of Rodriguez so that retailers can reach nearby customers.

52. **Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0076217) in view of Keskar et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0125216) and further in view of Pelletier (U.S. Patent No. 6,690,883).**

53. Regarding *claim 24*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 19, the combination of Rodriguez and Keskar discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. While Rodriguez does disclose providing textual information to a user, he fails to specifically disclose providing text with a keyword describing the subject, although it is more than likely that he does at some point, when describing the history or other data associated with the subject. Pelletier, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to provide a camera with keywords based on

location information for annotation when capturing an image. More specifically, Pelletier discloses a camera (110) which annotates an image based on the location and subject of the image using a key word. See column 3, line 48 to column 4, line 55. This feature allows the user to understand what they are viewing and capturing an image of. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a keyword describing the subject with the metadata of Rodriguez, so that the user knows what they are looking at.

54. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Shibuya (Japanese Publ. No. 2001-169164 A) discloses the ability to determine the location and direction of a camera and display the name of a determined subject.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Villecco whose telephone number is (571) 272-7319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



John M. Villecco  
October 13, 2006